

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

ROBERT RICHARDS, et al.,

Case No. 2:16-cv-00346-JCM-PAL

Plaintiffs,

ORDER

v.

JOHN IZBICKI, et al.,

Defendants.

This matter is before the court on Defendant Britain's Status Report re: Failure of the Parties to Meet and Confer as Ordered by the Court Pursuant to Docket Entry 21 (Dkt. #27). Plaintiff Robert Richards filed a Notice of Change of Address (Dkt. #28), but has not provided a telephone number. It is not clear whether both Plaintiffs have moved, or only Mr. Roberts.

Local Rule 26-1(a) provides:

The pro se plaintiff of plaintiff's attorney must initiate the scheduling of the conference required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) to be held within 30 days after the first defendant answers or otherwise appears. Fourteen days after the mandatory Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) conference, the parties must submit a stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. The plan must be formatted to permit the plan, once the court approves it, to become the scheduling order required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b). If the plan sets deadlines within those specified in LR 26-1(b), the plan must state on its face in bold type, "SUBMITTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH LR 26-1(b)." If longer deadlines are proposed, the plan must state on its face "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." Plans requesting special scheduling review must include, in addition to the information required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and LR 26-1(b), a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case or, in cases in which the parties disagree on the form or contents of the discovery plan, a statement of each party's position on each point in dispute.

Plaintiffs have not complied with their obligation to initiate the Rule 26(f) meeting, and have not complied with the court's May 10, 2016 Order (Dkt. #21).

Accordingly,

///

